

**REMARKS**

Claims 21-24 currently appear in this application. The Office Action of August 25, and the Advisory Action of December 23, 2003, have been carefully studied. These claims define novel and unobvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103 of 35 U.S.C., and therefore should be allowed. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration, entry of the present amendment, and formal allowance of the claims.

**Specification**

The Abstract of the Disclosure is objected to because it is too long. Accordingly, a new Abstract of the Disclosure containing fewer than 60 words is submitted herewith on a separate sheet.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 9-12 have been replaced by new claims 21-24. Support for these

claims can be found in the specification as filed at page 8, line 14 through page 10, line 27.

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 9-12 have been replaced by new claims 21-24. It is believed that claims 21-24 conform to all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112.

#### Art Rejections

Claims 9-12 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4 and 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,489,111, hereinafter Takaishi et al. '111.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 9-12 have been cancelled, and new claims 21-24 presented herein. It is believed that claims 21-24 differ patentably from claims 4 and 5 of Takaishi et al. '111.

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takaishi et al. '111.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. New claims 21-24 require the use of clearly recited apparatus for

Appln. No. 10/030,619  
Amd. dated  
Reply to Office Action of

feeding solutions and controlling the reaction conditions.  
None of these is shown or suggested in Takaishi et al.'111.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being  
anticipated by Schena et al. or Schmidt et al.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. There is  
nothing in either Schena et al. or Schmidt et al. that  
discloses or suggests the specific apparatus used in  
combination with the herein claimed method.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted  
that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and  
favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By



Anne M. Kornbau  
Registration No. 25,884

AMK:jec  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\T\TOYO\takahashi30\pto\AMDDraft13JAN04.doc